

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 16, 17, and 19 have been formally amended to clarify the scope of the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by these amendments. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification and original claims, specifically on page 3, lines 1-3 and page 10, lines 17-21.

Rejection of Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims are directed to a non-statutory subject matter, specifically, the claims are not directed towards the final result that is “useful, tangible and concrete.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the assertion regarding claims 1-18 of the present invention. The practical application of the present claimed invention is providing a system that allows “individual organizations of a plurality of different organizations to manage access of employees to at least one remotely located application hosted by an application service provider,” as recited in independent claims 1, 16, 17 and 19. The tangible, concrete and useful result is that the system supports “the user in managing access of an employee of the particular organization to an application and excluding access by employees of organizations other than said particular organization.” Applicant respectfully submits that this exclusion of access satisfies the statutory requirements under 35 USC 101. Specifically, the exclusion performed by the present claimed invention provides increased security and efficiency for customer account management systems (Specification page 2, lines 4-5). Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-13 and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-13 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Evans (U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074).

The present claimed invention provides a system enabling individual organizations of a plurality of different organizations to manage access of employees to at least one remotely located application hosted by an application service provider. At least one database contains data representing a plurality of user interface images associated with a corresponding plurality of organizations, and a plurality of executable procedures associated with the corresponding plurality of user interface images. An executable procedure supports a user of a particular organization of the plurality of organizations in managing access of employees of the particular organization to an application hosted by an application service provider and used by said plurality of organizations. A command processor employs the at least one database for initiating execution of a particular executable procedure in response to a command initiated using a particular user interface image associated with the particular executable procedure and with the particular organization, the particular executable procedure supporting the user in managing access of an employee of the particular organization to an application and excluding access by employees of organizations other than the particular organization. Claims 1, 16, 17 and 19 include features similar to those described above. These features are neither disclosed nor suggested by Evans.

Evans describes a medical records system where authorized healthcare providers can access, analyze, update and electronically annotate patient data even while other providers are using the same patient record (Abstract). Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action fundamentally misunderstands the present claimed invention. The present claimed invention is primarily concerned with managing “access of employees” to an “application hosted by an **application service provider**.” As is well known in the art of customer management systems, an Application Service Provider (ASP) hosts an application for use by different organizations. The ASP generally charges a fee per transaction or hour of use, for example. Nowhere in Evans is there any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure describing ASP. Unlike the present claimed invention, Evans is concerned with the manipulation of patient data in a singular organization and enabling

different providers within the organization to simultaneously manipulate the same patient record.

Contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, Evans neither discloses nor suggests, “a plurality of executable procedures associated with the corresponding plurality of user interface images, an executable procedure supporting a user of a particular organization of said plurality of organizations in managing access of employees of the particular organization to an application hosted by an application service provider and used by said plurality of organizations,” as recited in the present claimed invention. Rather, column 12, line 66 to column 13, line 15 of Evans cited in the Office Action, merely describes the server including a multi-processor personal computer, a storage device, a backup server and various peripherals, such as a scanner. Nowhere in this passage or elsewhere in Evans is there any description or suggestion of the particular organization being one of a “plurality of organizations.” Nor is there any 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure of supporting a user of that one organization “in managing access of employees,” of that one organization, “to an application hosted by an application service provider and used by said plurality of organizations,” as in the present claimed invention. Evans is concerned with the automation and simplification of electronic patient chart creation, maintenance and retrieval. Evans provides a system for healthcare users that “enables them to capture and analyze patient data quickly and efficiently” (Evans column 2, lines 21-31). The system of Evans is used in a singular organization, and does not use applications that are used by other organizations. The present invention, on the other hand, “restricts access so that customer account administrators have no access to user accounts assigned to other organizations. The system permits customers to be self-sufficient to manage their own application user accounts, without requiring intervention by or cooperation with another party. The system provides real time savings for customers, and requires less staff time at the application service provider support help desk to perform account management functions” (Specification page 3, lines 1-7).

Applicant further respectfully submits that Evans neither discloses nor suggests, “a command processor employing the at least one database for initiating execution of a particular executable procedure in response to a command initiated using a particular user interface image associated with the particular executable procedure and with the particular organization, the particular executable procedure supporting the user in managing access of an employee of the particular organization to an application and excluding access by employees of organizations other than said particular organization,” as recited in the present claimed invention. While column 15, lines 22-32 of Evans, cited in the Office Action describe restricting access to information, Applicant respectfully submits that this is not equivalent to the features of the present invention. Evans describes restricting healthcare provider access to **patient data** using a tiered password system, thereby ensuring patient confidentiality. The present claimed invention, on the other hand, describes restricting “access of employees to at least one remotely located **application** hosted by an application service provider,” as recited in the present claimed invention. As described above, unlike Evans, the present claimed invention is concerned with different organizations using the same application service provider. The present claimed invention “restricts access so that customer account administrators have no access to user accounts assigned to other organizations,” (Specification page 3, lines 1-3). Evans is concerned with users accessing patient data within a single organization. There is no enabling disclosure that suggests Evans contemplates controlling access of users of outside organizations. Additionally, Evans provides no mechanism for accomplishing this objective. Contrary to Evans, the claimed arrangement provides “a command processor employing the at least one database for initiating execution of a particular executable procedure in response to a command initiated using a particular user interface image associated with the particular executable procedure and with the particular organization, the particular executable procedure supporting the user in managing access of an employee of the particular organization to an application and excluding access by employees of organizations other than said particular organization.” Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits the rejection of claims 1, 16, 17 and 19 under 35 USC 102(b) has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1. Claim 2 is considered to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 3-4 are dependent on claim 1 and are patentable for the reasons give above with respect to claim 1. Claims 3-4 are also considered to be patentable because Evans neither discloses nor suggests that, “the authorization processor excludes access of the user and employees of the particular organization to user interface images and executable procedures and data associated with organizations other than the particular organization” and “the authorization processor excludes access to the user and employees of the particular organization to data associated with organizations other than the particular organization by removing permission of the user and employees of the particular organization to access the data associated with the other organizations from a directory of permissions used to control data access,” as respectively cited in the present claimed invention. Claims 3 and 4 of the present invention “exclude access” and “remove permission” of certain users to ensure that the users and employees of the organization only have access to their own data, and not access to the data of other organizations using the same application hosted by the application service provider. Column 2, lines 45-50 of Evans, cited in the Office Action, on the other hand, describes that authorized healthcare workers are provided access to the patient’s medical record. Further, Column 2, lines 50-60 and column 15, lines 20-32 of Evans merely describes that different healthcare workers within the organization may have access to different patient records. Evans is silent with regards to a system response to unauthorized healthcare workers. The present claimed invention, on the other hand, affirmatively recites that “the authorization processor excludes access.” Unlike the Evans system, which is concerned with **patient data within a single organization**, the present claimed invention is concerned with authorizing access to **applications used by different organizations**. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Evans neither discloses nor suggests the features of the present claimed invention.

Claim 5 is dependent on claims 1 and 4. Claim 5 is considered to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to claims 1 and 4.

Claim 6 is dependent on claim 1 and is patentable for the reasons give above with respect to claim 1. Claim 6 is also considered to be patentable because Evans neither discloses nor suggests, “the authorization processor removes the permission of the user and employees of the particular organization in response to addition of the particular organization as a new organization to the plurality of organizations,” as recited in the present claimed invention. Thus, when the particular organization is added to the plurality of organizations using the application hosted by the ASP, the “authorization processor removes the permission of the user and employees of the particular organization,” so that the particular employees are only able to access the data of their particular organization. Applicant respectfully submits that Evans is silent with regards to the affirmative act of removing permission. As there is no suggestion or description in Evans of removing permission, there is also no suggestion or description for when that permission is removed, such as “in response to addition of the particular organization as a new organization to the plurality of organizations,” as recited in the present claimed invention. As described above with respect to claims 3-4, the passages cited in the Office Action merely describe that authorized healthcare workers are provided access to the patient’s medical record and that different healthcare workers within the organization may have access to different patient records. Thus Applicant respectfully submits that Evans provides no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure describing the features of the present claimed invention.

Claim 7 is dependent on claim 1. Claim 7 is considered to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 8 is dependent on claim 1 and is patentable for the reasons give above with respect to claim 1. Claim 8 is also considered to be patentable because Evans neither discloses nor suggests, “an executable procedure enables the user to at least one of, (a) add an employee and (b) remove an employee, of an organization as a user entitled to access the application hosted by the application service provider,” as recited in the present claimed invention. Rather, column 14, lines 30-42 of Evans, cited in the Office

Action, merely describes that all patient data is electronically created and maintained. The electronic records cut down on the storage space for physical files and eliminate mishandling, loss and destruction of patient data. Applicant respectfully submits that maintaining a patient file is not equivalent to giving or removing employee access to an application hosted by an application service provider. Applicant respectfully submits this passage and elsewhere in Evans provide no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure of, “an executable procedure enables the user to at least one of, (a) add an employee and (b) remove an employee, of an organization as a user entitled to access the application hosted by the application service provider,” as recited in the present claimed invention.

Claim 9 is dependent on claims 1 and 8 and is patentable for the reasons give above with respect to claims 1 and 8. Claim 9 is also considered to be patentable because Evans neither discloses nor suggests, “the executable procedure changes authorization information associated with the added or removed employee,” as recited in the present claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits that contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, providing different healthcare workers within the organization access to different patient records, as described in column 15, lines 20-32 of Evans, is not equivalent changing authorization of an employee when the employee is removed from the system or added to the system. Further, a system administrator having global password access merely indicates that they can have access to any patient record. Nowhere in Evans is there any indication that global password access enables a system administrator to change the access of an employee to the system. Even if a global password access enabled the system administrator to perform this task, the task would still be performed by a system administrator. The present claimed invention, on the other hand, provides for “an executable procedure”, and not a system administrator, to change “authorization information associated with the added or removed employee.” Thus, Applicant respectfully submits Evans neither discloses nor suggests, “the executable procedure changes authorization information associated with the added or removed employee,” as recited in the present claimed invention.

Claim 10 is dependent on claim 1 and is patentable for the reasons give above with respect to claims 1. Claim 10 is also considered to be patentable because Evans neither discloses nor suggests, “an executable procedure enables the user to amend information used in authorizing a particular employee of an organization to access the application hosted by the application service provider,” as recited in the present claimed invention. Column 2, lines 45-55 of Evans, cited in the Office Action, merely describe the healthcare workers are able to annotate the patient records. Applicant respectfully submits that annotating the information stored in the patient records is not equivalent to amending information “used in **authorizing** a particular employee of an organization to access the application hosted by the application service provider,” as in the present invention. The annotated patient records of Evans have no relation to authorizing access to an application. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits Evans neither discloses nor suggests, “an executable procedure enables the user to amend information used in authorizing a particular employee of an organization to access the application hosted by the application service provider,” as recited in the present claimed invention.

Claims 11, 12, 13 and 15 are dependent on claim 1. Claims 11, 12, 13 and 15 are considered to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 18 is dependent on claim 17. Claim 18 is considered to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 17.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims, it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure in Evans that makes the present claimed invention unpatentable. Thus, in view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 16, 17 and 19 are not anticipated by Evans. As claims 2-13 and 15 are dependent on claim 1 and claim 18 is dependent on claim 17, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also not anticipated by Evans. It is thus further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans (U.S. Patent No. 5,924,074) in view of Tuunanen et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0169776).

Claim 14 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Claim 14 is also considered to be patentable for the following reasons. As admitted on page 7 of the Office Action, Evans neither discloses nor suggests, “the particular executable procedure comprises a template procedure customized by at least one of, (a) the user and (b) a technician,” as recited in the present claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits that contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, Tuunanen also neither discloses nor suggests this feature combination. Tuunanen describes a system that uses service scripts for “controlling the call handling in a communication network operated, e.g. according to the internet protocol, and hereinafter also referred to as all-IP network,” (paragraph 0001). The service scripts provide a means to create and manage value added services in a centralized fashion but distribute fully the service execution (Tuunanen paragraph 0003). The Tuunanen system is concerned with improving the usage of CPL scripts. Call Processing Language (CPL) scripts are related to IP telephony, which enables calls and multimedia sessions such as simultaneous video and audio calls to be set-up across IP networks (Tuunanen, paragraphs 0006, 0013). Paragraphs 0095, 0096 and 0102 of Tuunanen, cited in the Office Action, merely describe that a user may select a script template from the scripts already made by the network operator, thereby ensuring that script execution does neither hazard nor harm normal call handling. Applicant respectfully submits that script templates are entirely unlike the template procedure described by the present claimed invention. The template procedure of the present claimed invention is an executable procedure that has been customized to change the authorization information associated with employees of the organization (Specification page 11, lines 8-13). The templates created by the network operator used to control call handling in a communication network, as in Tuunanen is entirely unlike and unrelated to determining access of an employee to an application hosted by the application service provider, as in the present invention. Thus, Tuunanen neither discloses nor suggests, “the

particular executable procedure comprises a template procedure customized by at least one of, (a) the user and (b) a technician,” as recited in the present claimed invention.

It is also further respectfully submitted that there is no reason or motivation to combine Evans with Tuunanen. Evans is concerned with an electronic medical records system allowing authorized healthcare providers to access, analyze, update and annotate patient data even while other providers are using the same patient record. Tuunanen is concerned with improving the usage of CPL scripts within an all-IP communication network. Evans and Tuunanen are concerned with entirely different areas of art. Evans is concerned with electronic patient medical records, while Tuunanen is concerned with using CPL scripts as an easy to implement language for IP telephony supplementary service creation. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of these references is not proper.

However, even if there was reason or motivation to combine these two references, the combination of the system of Evans with the system of Tuunanen, as suggested in the Office Action would not result in the present claimed invention. This combination would result in a system that uses CPL scripts to create the electronic patient medical records. Evans and Tuunanen, alone or in combination, neither disclose nor suggest, “a system enabling individual organizations of a plurality of different organizations to manage access of employees to at least one remotely located application hosted by an application service provider,” as recited in the present claimed invention. Evans and Tuunanen, alone or in combination, also neither disclose nor suggest, “a plurality of executable procedures associated with the corresponding plurality of user interface images, an executable procedure supporting a user of a particular organization of said plurality of organizations in managing access of employees of the particular organization to an application hosted by an application service provider and used by said plurality of organizations,” as recited in the present claimed invention. Evans and Tuunanen, alone or in combination, also neither disclose nor suggest, “a command processor employing the at least one database for initiating execution of a particular executable procedure in response to a command initiated using a particular user interface image associated with

the particular executable procedure and with the particular organization, the particular executable procedure supporting the user in managing access of an employee of the particular organization to an application and excluding access by employees of organizations other than said particular organization,” as recited in the present claimed invention. Nor do Evans and Tuunanen, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest, “the particular executable procedure comprises a template procedure customized by at least one of, (a) the user and (b) a technician,” as recited in the present claimed invention.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure in either Evans or Tuunanen, when taken alone or in combination, that makes the present claimed invention unpatentable. As claim 14 is dependent on claim 1, it is considered to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, in addition to the reasons given above regarding claim 14. It is thus further respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,



Alexander J. Burke
Reg. No. 40,425

Date: November 27, 2006

Alexander J. Burke
Intellectual Property Department
Siemens Corporation,
Customer No.: 28524
Tel. 732 321 3023
Fax 732 321 3030